



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,688	01/18/2002	Denise R. Barbut	270/236	4085
34263	7590	04/21/2005	EXAMINER	
O'MELVENY & MEYERS 114 PACIFICA, SUITE 100 IRVINE, CA 92618			THOMPSON, MICHAEL M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/052,688	BARBUT ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael M. Thompson	Art Unit 3763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 27/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simeone (1972) or Simeone et al. (1972) or Simeone (1995) in view of Fisch (6,468,200). Milder et al. teaches all of the limitations of the claims except for a sausage shaped balloon and a balloon length of approximately 3-6 cm . Fisch teaches a sausage shaped balloon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to have modified the balloon structure of Simeone (1972) or Simeone et al. (1972) or Simeone (1995) [assuming Simeone does not already teach a sausage shaped balloon] as a sausage shaped balloon as taught by Fisch as taught in the art of intra-aortic balloons for optimal fit within the aorta.

Furthermore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to reduce the balloon length to approximately 6 cm or 3-6 cm because Applicant has not disclosed that a balloon length of 3-6 cm provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with a length of 7-10 cm balloon because both a balloon length of 3-6 cm or 7-8 cm perform the same

function of preventing flow within the aorta depending mostly on inflation and the size of the subject. Please note that a change in shape of a prior art device is a design consideration within the skill of the art. *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). In the event, however, that Applicant does successfully traverses the specific ranges setting forth the criticality of invention, it is the Examiner's position that the Simeone references are performing the exact same function as Applicant, cerebral perfusion, are likely of the same lengths and are certainly capable of modification.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 02/07/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is the Examiner's position that the newly presented prior art, in the field of Applicant's endeavor is of greater importance than the Milder et al reference. It should be noted however, that the Examiner has read Applicant's declaration with respect to IABP balloons. While the expertise of Applicant's consultant Dr. Wahr is well taken the Examiner is unclear as to the differences in volume displacement between IABP and cerebral perfusion procedures as it relates to balloon length. If Applicant or Dr. Wahr could provide a comparison for the Examiner, the Examiner can better compare the procedures while addressing the instant application.

Art Unit: 3763

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Michael Thompson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4968. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 am to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Nick Lucchesi, can be reached on (571) 272-4977. The official fax phone number for all submissions to the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Michael M. Thompson

Patent Examiner


MICHAEL M. THOMPSON
SUPPLY & MATERIALS EXAMINER
TELEPHONE 272-4968/30

MT 

April 6, 2005